



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ago. Five of the twelve firms continuing the plan have since abandoned it, but several new ones have made good this loss.

Mr. Gilman's main motive, the elevation of the lot of the employé, is most cordially approved, his work of investigation is commended, his presentation of facts is worthy of high praise, but his special contention as to the exceptional merit and the success of the one modification of the wage system can be accepted only in so far as profit-sharing is indicative of a fundamental principle not peculiar to itself.

PAUL MONROE.

TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Columbia University.

The United Kingdom. A Political History. By GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L. 2 vols. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899.

WHEN six years ago there appeared from the pen of Goldwin Smith a *Political History of the United States*, the author was by no means unknown to the American public. During the twenty-five years of his residence in Canada he had written much upon current political and sociological topics; he had even dipped into the more peaceful, but hardly less turgid, stream of literary criticism; but no historical work had appeared from his pen since the publication of his *Three English Statesmen*, in 1867. His readers were hardly surprised, therefore, to find that even Goldwin Smith could not easily turn aside from the habits of thought and composition of a quarter of a century, and once more write history, pure and simple, out of the calm, serene atmosphere which is supposed to environ the viewpoint of the critical historian. To some the book was a disappointment; it contained no contribution to the existing sum-total of historical knowledge upon American history. The author claimed to have overhauled no new, or hitherto unpublished, manuscript. He fired no heavy shot in plethoric footnotes at any of his contemporaries who had been unfortunate enough to let loose their books on the public first. He made no attempt to challenge any current fallacies, but repeated them all, and added some glaring inaccuracies of his own. And yet the book was read widely, and commented upon, for the most part favorably, as one of the most original and stimulating books on American history published within the century. It was Goldwin Smith; and Goldwin Smith shone through every page of the text.

Just such another book is Goldwin Smith's *Political History of the*

United Kingdom, appearing now six years later. To such a book the reviewer cannot apply the ordinary canons of criticism by which he would rate the common run of historical writings. Distinctly there is here no new contribution to English history as such. A simple reading of the list of authorities, as given by the author in the preface, precludes any expectation of meeting new or novel facts in his pages. His *data* have all been presented to the public before, and well presented too. And yet the book is as fresh and vigorous and stimulating as a breath from one of the author's Canadian snowfields. There is not a dull line in it.

This effectiveness is due in part to the author's well-known originality and vigor, which show no sign of abating, in spite of the burden of seventy-six years. The *Three English Statesmen*, or the perhaps better-known *Lectures on Modern History*, reveal no more power, nor glow with more of the fire of youth. But even more than to style the author owes his strength to the practical spirit which pervades all his work. Upon him the ideas of the scientific school of history have little hold; to him "truth for truth's sake" is an empty abstraction. History to him is always an open volume; a scripture, full of commandments and prohibitions, with a direct and meaningful application to the present. If the past have no lesson for the present, it is not history.

Goldwin Smith, in short, belongs to a noble school of historians who are now passing away; who read the history of nations to explain existing political or moral conditions; who gave the personal equation full play, and tilted their glasses heavenward, often with eyes hooded or vision clouded; who consulted history as theologians used to consult the Scriptures, to find the texts wherewith to tack together some favored system.

There is always the smell of burning powder about such men. They write with vigor. They paint with much color—furious color sometimes—often descending to mere political pamphleteering. Yet such books have their place. They may add little to historical knowledge; but even your fish-cold scholar may gain new life and stimulus by reading them. It is much to have the moral vision, even of the scientific historian, clarified at times by such furious blasts, and be reminded again and again that he, after all, deals not with sticks and stones, but with men and women, moral beings, who move in categories far other than the mollusks who vegetate in the silent sands of some antediluvian strand; that his data are the ideals, passions, motives, acts,

of responsible creatures; and to discuss them, while he need not take out an advocate's brief or cultivate the vituperative style of Judge Jeffries or the insane ravings of old Lias, the crazy schoolmaster of David Greive, he must mount the judgment seat. He deals with persons, not things.

Goldwin Smith represents his school at its best. He is not an advocate; he is a judge, and a severely honest judge at that; yet he knows no law save the common law of the later nineteenth century. Hence his judgments are often severe; and a severe judgment is always an unjust judgment. He forgets that in history, as in current life, right is always concrete, never abstract; always relative, never absolute; always assuming new form and color, never changeless; that a principle of action which may be right today might not have been right eight hundred years ago, and *vice versa*; that political and social conditions might have justified certain forms of violence in the eleventh century, which in the end of the nineteenth would be deemed worthy of the hangman's cord. Hence he has little sympathy with William the Conqueror, and fails utterly to understand the gay, the roistering, the unbelieving William Rufus, the freethinking agnostic on the throne, who in his own rough, wild way struggled with the forces of disruption, and sought to bring order out of the chaos of his time.

As may be supposed, this terrible judge has short shrift for poor old John Lackland, or Henry VIII., while upon the "Hanoverian swine" he exhausts the vocabulary of gentlemanly vituperation. He pays tribute to the genius of Strafford, but refuses to remove a single shadow from the obloquy of his great apostasy. To him he is still "the renegade Wentworth." On the other hand, Elliot, Hampden, Pym, and above all Cromwell, appeal powerfully to the hero-worshiper. He can even condone the brutal massacres of Drogheda and Wexford, and seems to think it was something in Cromwell's favor that only a part of the garrisons were native Irish; as though Cromwell ever boggled at the killing of an Irishman.

Throughout, the book is colored by the author's political sympathies; and though he wisely closes his chapter on "The Empire," his last chapter, before he reaches the stirring questions of contemporary history, the reader feels that these questions are never absent from his mind. Of the Norman and his conquest, for which he has nothing of the admiration of the average Englishman, he writes: "The Norman was a favorite of the papacy. Though a marauder, he was ecclesiastical, and everywhere pious and papal in his rapine. To bring

Germany into subjection to the vicar of Christ, Hildebrand filled her with civil war. To bring England into the same subjugation, he laid his curse upon her rightful king, blessed the unrighteous invader, and sent a consecrated banner and ring as pledges that the favor of God would be with the army of iniquity. The power which thus sought its ends is styled moral, in contrast to the power of force. Superstition is no more moral than force, and to effect its object it has to suborn force, as it did in hallowing the Norman invasion of England."

The author has no more love to waste upon the pope than Freeman; hence he fails to understand the Tractarian movement, and charges the leaders with unworthy motives; yet when he comes to treat of the Irish question, unlike Freeman, so bitter is his hatred of injustice and tyranny of all kinds, so broad and so catholic are his sympathies with the oppressed, that he can forget religious differences and, cutting straight through the knot, has the courage to point out to his fellow countrymen, what is clear enough to all the rest of the world, that "the necessary conditions of the solution of the Irish problem are the reform of the land law, the leveling of all barriers of race and religion—the substitution, in short, of a genuine union for a union of ascendancy, dependence, and exclusion."

The book abounds in inaccuracies of statement. It is hardly worth while, however, to review them in detail. The first quotation above presents a very good specimen. No one questions the influence of Hildebrand in the papal curia during the reigns of his immediate predecessors; yet the man who sent the ring and the banner to William in 1066, who did the cursing and the blessing, was not Hildebrand, but Alexander II.

BENJAMIN TERRY.

The Care of Destitute, Neglected, and Delinquent Children. By HOMER FOLKS. *The Charities Review*, 1900. Pp. 142.

THE author is one of the first authorities on the subject treated in this monograph. The topics are treated historically, the present tendencies are noted, the standards of criticism are applied to existing methods, and maxims of great practical value are interspersed. The history of treatment covers the entire century, and discusses public care of destitute children, private charities for destitute children, removal of children from almshouses, public systems, delinquent children. A select bibliography adds great value to the treatise. This little book should grow in the hands of this competent leader into a large volume.

C. R. HENDERSON.